Miss E. Loop

THE LIBERATOR

—IS PUBLISHED—

EVERY FRIDAY MORNING,

—AT—

251 WASHINGTON STREET, ROOM No. 6.

ROBERT F. WALLCUT, General Agent.

☞ TERMS—Two dollars and fifty cents per annum, in advance.

☞ No paper will be sent to any address for one dollar, if payment be made in advance.

☞ All remittances are to be made, and all letters relating to the pecuniary concerns of this paper are to be directed (post paid) to the General Agent.

☞ Advertisements inserted at the rate of five cents per line.

☞ The Agents of the American, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Ohio and Michigan Anti-Slavery Societies are authorized to receive subscriptions for The Liberator.

☞ The following gentlemen constitute the Financial Committee, but are not responsible for any debts of the paper, viz.—Samuel Sewall, Edmund Quincy, Edmund Jackson, and Wendell Phillips.

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, Editor.

J. B. YERRINTON & SON, Printers.

VOL. XXXI. NO. 15. BOSTON, FRIDAY, APRIL 12, 1861 WHOLE NO. 1581.

Refuge of Oppression.

WHAT THE ABOLITIONISTS HAVE DONE.

A short time in the history of nations, gentlemen—thirty years only—when I had no gray hair on my head, but was young and full of hope, and the hope of youth, this incident occurred, and it can be mingled only as a newspaper and the Liberator, called the Liberator, and the Governor of Virginia, and the Governor of Massachusetts, and I wish to know more about it.

I am told that a newspaper has been published that the paper had been sent to the Governor of this particular State, in insubordination and insolent remonstrance. What, said the Governor, is the message of the paper? Is it that the principles of liberty adhere this paper to slave? He denied certain that there is any danger in the liberty of me. I have carefully examined, and immediately made it my business to ask the origin. Many of the old and tedious search, I discovered that it was published by an unprincipled man, who had been convicted in the acts of a worse issue in a local retreat of the slave. He was a man of no character, and of no character, his whole concern is a small, dirty sum, and he was willing to do anything for money, even to throw out the cry which he supposed to be acceptable. I think the Governor of Virginia—the Governor of the great Old Commonwealth which led the van in the Revolutionary war—may rest assured that there is no danger in the liberty of Virginia from this source." That was there, years ago, and, in time, this little subject was put on a small circuit in the heavens, not bigger than a crazy bird's nest, as I said? God in his mercy has ordered that events like which fare of the heavens—it has proven to be powerful to refute and to put the bulwark of constitutional liberty and freedom. That is the history of it. That is the history of it, and I am very grateful. It was not into the hands of the Lords of God, and created divisions there and then, with organizations, with men, as we now see it, but one gravestone than the God of heaven when he gave love and children of Israel! He created a slavery in a curse, and that dominion will attend to you who are in the country where slavery is, and say, you cannot sit down at the table of the Lord that is given to you, you cannot for many a day. I will tell you upon the subject. It is quite a long story to tell you, but until it is over, it is unnecessary that I should dwell any longer upon it.

Now, gentlemen, I have told you the history of the Abolitionists, and I have told you the history of fundamental rights which we hold dear, and this finally culminated in the formation of the Republican and glorious Union. What is the which they republicans regard as a party? God in his mercy made an event with his own fingers upon Mount Sinai, "Thou shalt not make unto thyself any graven image," and of these fanatics will deal with this subject in a religious manner. I would have them remember what the first slaveholder in the history of the world did, and what was the result of it. Let them read the Bible, and see what was the result of it. Let them read it (Applause and laughter.) It is a balanced production, and I assure you, gentlemen, that God, in his own time, will bring into the world the Abolitionists, and the suppression of the will of Divine Providence. With all reverence, allow me to state to you that you must not be a fanatic and an antislavery God, that if the doctrine of Moses has its root in the Republican party, I refer you to the New Testament, and there seek some further light. (Laughter.) I have not been a very free slave-owner. St. Paul sustained the doctrine of slavery, and everywhere in the world it has been so—from antiquity, and everywhere it has been countenanced by the will of God, through which it is sanctioned by a gracious universe, to be maintained and governed in conformity with his purpose. So it therefore to be considered that slavery is not against religion? God thought not—Moses thought not—Jesus Christ thought not—Christ thought not—the Constitution thought not. (Applause.) But how stands it to-day? That is a very serious thing, that the institutions of African slavery as the United States was established, is to this day the curse of the children of Israel from the basis of the Egyptian. It is a curse which God has put upon it, and let the oppressed be free, and let the slaves be free as well as other rich, and the oppressed were free, when Moses was in the chariot was a curse set up in the deep. (Applause.) How came African slavery to be established? Was it not that the Egyptian entered peopled it? What great national policy dictated it? What great religious principle permeated it? What great sentiment of philanthropy dictated it? Was it not the Bible—the people sprung from the beginning—here were a people found in a wilderness, the most degraded, the most brutal heart can contemplate, who by some providence were brought into contact with the white race, and the hand of mercy was laid to this country in the sentain and engage in these pursuits which proclaim to the world's highest conduct—and what has been the result? The institution has prospered here, and all the nations have been in favor of it. From being savages, they have come to be civilized—from being savages, they have become happy and contented. We are now known, I believe, in history, under such circumstances were planted, and has my country been established? Is it the result of the operation of the combined influence of the world and has it been established? Is it not the result of a providence? Is it a commercial point of view, in a national point of view, in a moral point of view, in a religious point of view, what is there in the Anglo-Saxon that distinguishes another race? Is it? Is those people here advanced, and had their nature been changed by the institution of God's providence, and they say you are sinners, the curse of God is known as you are? Then we will have no more to do with you! This has been going on for thirty years in this country, and I will tell you what has been done. I will advise it. Is there any institution in the world that has been more instrumental in the blessing of life—in the conversion of the people? Is there a nation of Africans in the world? Is there a nation of Africans in the world? Is there a nation of Africans in the world

THE REIGN OF RUFFIANISM.

To the Editor of the New York Tribune:

SIR,—In January last, the Indian Queen arrived at St. Mark's, Florida, from Aspinwall, for a cargo of cotton. The second officer and myself were taken down with Chagres fever, and were sent ashore to the Marine Hospital. This is a neat brick and stone two-story building, which cost the United States $20,000, and is the only good building in the place. The physician in the Hospital was a violent Secessionist, and a delegate to the Secession Convention. After we had been a few days in the Hospital, the physician came home from the Convention, and told us that the State had seceded, and turned us out of the Hospital. I have paid Marine Hospital dues for twenty-two years, and this was the first time that I had ever had occasion to receive any benefit from these humane institutions, established by the Government, but supported by seamen. Being thus ordered out of what I considered my home while an invalid, I was obliged to pay $30 for my expenses while there sick. The physician said he thought it well for the Southern States to remain in the Union so long as they had the Government in their hands; but, as they had now lost control of it, they would break up the Union. He thought as the United States had now no further use for the Hospital, they would give that and other public works in the State up to Florida.

The Indian Queen lay about half a mile from land, though some ten miles below the town. We had in our crew seven colored men—able seamen. A plot was formed to take these out of the ship, and sell them into slavery; but the conspirators (among them a Judge of the Supreme Court) were overheard at their midnight meeting, and the captain was informed by two o'clock in the morning of the danger that threatened his crew. He rose immediately, hired the only steamboat in the place, and by daylight had the ship towed over the bar outside, some five miles from shore, and beyond the jurisdiction of Florida. I was on shore at the time, and heard, the next morning, about the tallest swearing among the conspirators that ever greeted my ears. The Judge seemed to be the most enraged of any at the escape of his prey. They then threatened to go outside and kidnap the crew; but a report gained credit that the vessel was armed, and the crew would give the kidnappers a bloody reception if they attempted it. Besides, the vessel was then on the high seas, which would make it piracy. I was questioned as to how many negroes we had aboard, and what kind of hands they were.

A few days after the Ordinance of Secession passed, a resident of St. Mark's remarked that he thought the North were right and the South wrong, whereupon they seized and stripped and whipped him, and started him North on the train, with directions to run him out of the country.

WALTER D. MADDOCKS,
First Officer of bark Indian Queen.
New York, March 16, 1861.

ANOTHER ILLUSTRATION OF SOUTHERN HUMANITY—FOURTEEN WEEKS IN JAIL.

William H. Turner, of Manchester, New Hampshire, by profession an engineer and machinist, had for four years been in the habit of spending his Winters on the plantation of Woodworth & Son, at Clintonville, South Carolina, about seventeen miles from Charleston. Before the Presidential election, in reply to a question of one of his fellow-workmen, he said that if he had the casting vote, he would give it for Mr. Lincoln. About two weeks after the election, he was visited at the plantation by two men, probably vigilance committee men, who asked him if he had said what is reported above. He replied that he had. They then exhibited a warrant for his arrest, and informed him that he must go with them. The charge was of expressing Abolition sentiments.

Mr. Turner accompanied the men to Charleston, and was taken to the jail, where he was received by the turnkey, and immediately locked up. As he passed through the streets, the bystanders hissed, hooted, and assailed him with threats of hanging, tar, and whipping, following after to the jail, and there collecting in a large mob. These waited at the prison, clamoring for his life, and threatening to [illegible] persed the mob.

During the night, Mr. Turner suffered from hunger, but more acutely from thirst, the weather being most sultry and oppressive. In the morning, the Sheriff, whose name, he thinks, was Snodgrass, called at the jail, and the prisoner asked him if he would be pleased to give him a drink of water. The Sheriff replied, "Go to h—ll, and get water if you want it!" Some hours later, the turnkey was also asked for a cup of cold water. His reply was, "Send down East and get it!" In the afternoon he was taken before the "Vigilant Committee Tribunal," over which he thinks Judge Jeffers presided. He was asked his name, and whether he had said what was charged against him. He replied that he had said it. The Judge then tore up the original warrant, saying that another Court must take cognizance of the case, and ordered the prisoner back to jail, using the foulest language and declaring that he ought to be hanged.

Mr. Turner was then taken back to his cell, a bare stone apartment, 27 inches wide, and about eight feet long, dark, except when the full blaze of the sun fell on a skylight, which reflected some feeble rays. He passed that night, and every day and night of his imprisonment, in this hole, without a shred of bedding, or a piece of furniture of any sort, excepting a pail. The next morning, thirty-six hours after he was first taken, a small bit of hard black bread and a pint of impure water were put into the cell, and this was the allowance for each day during his confinement.

He was kept in jail till Monday, the 11 ult. During the period of this imprisonment—more than fourteen weeks—he saw no one but the attendants at the jail, his employer did not come to him, or communicate with him in any way. On the morning of the 11th of March, young Mr. Woodworth called on Mr. Turner, and said he would do the best he could to have him sent safely away, and that the wages due, $248, would be paid to him before he went. He then disappeared, and Mr. Turner saw him no more. The prisoner was shortly taken to the court-room, and asked by the Judge if he would leave the city in six hours if he should be released. He replied that he would leave if he could get away. He was then sent, in charge of the Sheriff, to the steamer, on which he worked his passage to this city. The mob howled after him on his way to the wharf, and endeavored to get him out of the officer's hands to lynch him, but were unsuccessful. As one of his minor experiences it may be said that, before his arrest, he had left his watch and chain with a watchmaker for repairs to the former. When he called for it, on his way to the vessel which was to take him home, the watchmaker refused to give either up, telling the owner to "go to h—ll"—a favorite manner of discharging obligations with the South Carolinians.—*New York Tribune*

WAR AT HAND!

The last dispatch of our Secessionist friend at Montgomery leaves no room for hope of a peaceable adjustment of our country's intestine troubles. The Jeff. Davis Confederacy has resolved to wage offensive war on the Government of the United States, and will assault or open fire on Fort Pickens forthwith. Meantime, the limited daily supply of fresh provisions hitherto allowed by Gov. Pickens to be furnished to Fort Sumter has been stopped, and we may hear at any moment that this Fort, too, has been carried by assault, or is so pressed that it must speedily surrender. Within a few days at farthest, the cannon of the insurgents will be battering down the defences and slaughtering the defenders of the American Union.

Let us pause a moment and consider.

Slavery makes open war upon *that Union which has so long been its protection and security.*

For thirty years, the opponents of slavery have borne the imputation—which not one in a hundred of them has deserved—of seeking their end through the dissolution of the Union.

In all this time, not a squadron has charged, not a platoon has fired, on the National flag and forces, under the inspiration of Anti-Slavery. Its advocates have been beaten at elections, hunted out of halls which they had hired and paid for, mobbed and maimed in the slave States, and generally proscribed and stigmatized in the free, without being goaded into hostilities. Only in Kansas, when compelled to choose between resistance and annihilation, have they been moved to repel force by force.

The Slave Power, after enjoying undisturbed sway for half a century, has at length lost an election. Hereupon, it proceeds to treat that election as a farce and a nullity, and defy those whom it invested with authority.

It has, while in power, loudly vaunted its fidelity and devotedness to the Federal Constitution. Losing power, it deliberately repudiates that charter, and adopts one radically different in its stead.

"The Union, the Union forever!" has been the vociferous cry of its servitors. Having lost an election, they treat that same Union as a hated curse, passing ordinances and raising armies for its overthrow.

"Let the laws be enforced!" it was thundered whenever the consciences of freemen revolted at the inhuman atrocities of slave-hunting in free States. But the moment the enforcement of the laws has devolved on Republicans, slavery denounces it as "coercion," and insists that it is inaugurating civil war!

And in fact to very many, North as well as South, slavery is above the Union, above the laws, above the Constitution. Rebellion, in their view, is opposition to slavery; while love of slavery and love of the Union are synonymous.

They plead for Peace, meaning that there be no further resistance to slavery. "National Unity," in their vocabulary, means a universal agreement that slavery is eminently right, and that it ought to be diffused universally and maintained forever.

And what is to be the attitude of the Northern opponents of the Republican party in the new era now opening before us?

They have professed to sustain slavery so far as the Constitution required, and no further. Slavery now repudiates the Constitution, breaks up the Union, and makes war on the Federal Government. If Northern Democracy allows its sympathies to follow slavery into treason, how shall it conceal, even from itself, the evidence of its own recreancy?

There is not even a pretence that the Federal Government has done or refused to do anything whereby this rebellion is justified. It has been pacific, forbearing, and most anxious to avoid a collision. It has allowed its troops to be disarmed, its arsenals to be robbed, its forts to be seized, its money to be stolen, and its revenues to be collected and appropriated by its open enemies. Through these high-handed villanies, a whole frontier has been opened to savage incursion and massacre, until even Mexico threatens an invasion. It has seriously lost ground with its friends by vainly seeking to conciliate its implacable foes. At length the great slaveholding rebellion is ready to unmask its batteries and open fire on the most exposed and isolated of the National defences. The challenge of its opening cannonade will soon reverberate over the country. The Union flag on Fort Sumter is to be shot down by the rebel batteries unless speedily lowered by the devoted garrison. The American Republic now enters upon the gravest perils it has known since the treason of Arnold. God grant that it pass through them with undoubting reliance on the omnipotence of Justice, and emerge at length, however tried and tested, unwavering in its loyalty to Freedom and the Rights of Man!—*New York Tribune*

FROM ANOTHER STAND-POINT.

The *Liberator*, in commenting upon Lincoln's Inaugural address, says,—

* * * * "To break up the Union *on a pretence or a suspicion of foul play,—perfidiously* seize fortifications, arsenals, and millions of other property belonging to the United States,—obstruct the collection of revenue, or use it for treasonable purposes,—fire upon a national steam-ship, and endeavor to sink it, while obeying legitimate orders,—strike down the American flag, and run up a State flag of defiance in its stead,—these are crimes of gigantic magnitude, which admit of no extenuation or atonement; and he who, intelligently conversant with them, does not brand them as the blackest treason, is himself a traitor at heart, and doubly to be detested if he pretends to have any concern for the preservation of the Union."

The deeds characterized as above would appear in a somewhat different light if viewed from another stand-point. Suppose that, instead of ignoring State sovereignty, we recognize it, and freely admit, what disunion abolitionists have always contended for—the *right* of a State to secede. This right being admitted, it is not for Massachusetts or Ohio to authoritatively indicate to South Carolina or Georgia as to how such provocation will justify them in seceding; they may leave the Union "on a pretence or a suspicion of foul play," or for any other reason they may choose to assign, or for no reason. None of these things affect the right of secession—a right for which all disunion abolitionists have consistently contended, until the Southern States have presumed to exercise it, not for the destruction of slavery, but for its perpetuation.

The property which belonged to the United States, in the event of a dissolution of the Union, would belong to the respective States in their just proportion, and the Northern States would actually have no more right of property in Southern forts and arsenals, than would the Southern States have in Northern forts and arsenals. The Confederate States wish to arrange with the old government for an equitable division of property, and for the assumption of their portion of the public debt. What proposition could be fairer than this?

Had the abolitionists succeeded—as they hoped to do—in inducing the North to withdraw from the Union, we can hardly imagine that the seceding Northern States would have permitted the South to retain and garrison with hostile forces the navy yards at Charlestown, Brooklyn and Philadelphia, and to possess the arsenal at Springfield and at other Northern points, but strongly suspect they would have taken possession of all Northern fortifications, manufactories of arms and deposits of public supplies that could otherwise be used against them to compel them to remain in the Union; and such act would not, by the usage of nations, be regarded as "perfidious," or "a crime of gigantic magnitude."

South Carolina, believing she had a right to secede, seceded; and, as a sovereign State, it was a duty she owed to herself to obtain possession of all fortifications which she justly supposed would or might be used to obstruct her in the exercise of that right. Having assumed the position of a sovereign State, unconnected in Federal Union with any others, pray, why should she not obstruct the collection of revenue of her people by another government, collect it herself according to the rates of her own tariff, and use it, not for treasonable purposes, but to defend herself against a government that had assumed the right to make her a tributary province?

That she should "fire upon a national steamship, and endeavor to sink it, while obeying legitimate orders," is neither surprising nor unjustifiable in the estimation of those who as fully admit the right of a Southern as of a Northern State to secede, and who remember that that steamship came to increase the facilities and the troops of another and an opposing government to bombard Charleston, and that said steamer was not in the fort held by the United States, but in the waters of Charleston harbor, where she came contrary to the wishes and against the express command of those in possession.

Nor is it remarkable that a Southern State, having exercised the right of secession, should "strike down the American flag, and run up a State flag of defiance in its stead." Had Massachusetts seceded, she would probably have done the same thing; for it would be acting under false colors for any seceding State to retain a flag that was none of hers, and would be an act worthy of censure.

Reviewing the doctrine of secession which, as a disunion abolitionist, we have endeavored to illustrate and advocate for many years—recognizing the sovereignty of each State, and its consequent right to withdraw from the Union, with or without cause—and believing we are as "intelligently conversant" with the measures of Southern secessionists, as we think we are with the wishes of Northern anti-slavery secessionists, we are not able, from our anti-slavery stand-point, to regard them as "crimes of gigantic magnitude, which admit of no extenuation or atonement," nor can we "brand them as the blackest treason,"—using the phrase in its ordinary sense,—nor do we believe one "are a traitor at heart" because we recognize the sovereignty of the State as legitimate, rather than the despotism of a central government.

And in maintaining the right of Southern States to secede, as well as Northern States, we no more endorse as defensible or reasonable or just, the plea which they urge as the cause for secession, than we endorse the intemperance of a man who spends his wages in liquor, because we contend that he, as well as the sober man, is entitled to a day's wages for a day's work, and that without reference to the reason that induces him to work, or the manner in which he spends his wages.—*Anti-Slavery Bugle.*

☞ For some comments upon the above, see our editorial columns.

The Liberator.

No Union with Slaveholders!

BOSTON, FRIDAY, APRIL 12, 1861.

TWENTY-SEVENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN A. S. SOCIETY.

The Twenty-Seventh Annual Meeting of the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY will be held in the Church of the Puritans, (Dr. Cheever's,) in the city of New York, on Tuesday, May 7, commencing at 10 o'clock, A. M. In the evening, another public meeting will be held in the Cooper Institute, commencing at half-past 7 o'clock.

The Society will meet, for business purposes only, in the Lecture Room of the Church of the Puritans, at 3½, P. M. on Tuesday, and at 10 A. M. Wednesday.

The object of this Society is still,—as at its formation,—the immediate and total abolition of slavery wherever existing on the American soil, because of its inherent sinfulness, immorality, oppression, and barbarity, and its utter repugnance to all the precepts of the Gospel, and all the principles of genuine Democracy; its measures are still the same,—peaceful, moral, rational, legal, constitutional, its instrumentalities are the same,—the pen, the press, the lecturing field, tracts and other publications, &c., &c., disseminating light and knowledge in regard to the tyrannical power claimed, possessed and exercised by slaveholders, the actual condition of their miserable victims, and the guilty complicity of the people of the North, religiously, politically, governmentally, with those who "trade in slaves and the souls of men"; its spirit is still the same,—long suffering, patient, hopeful, impartial, benevolent alike to the oppressor and the oppressed, zealously intent on "promoting the general welfare and securing the blessings of liberty" universally, "knowing no East, no West, no North, no South," but embracing the whole country in its charitable and humane concern, and conflicting with nothing just, honest, noble and Christian in sentiment, practice or tendency.

Whether the American Union, therefore, be dissolved or not, so long as a single slave is left in his fetters, this Society will still have its work unfinished, and will still deserve the countenance and aid of all believers in the inalienable rights of man—of all who "despise fraud, and loathe rapine, and abhor blood, and who reject with indignation the wild and guilty fantasy that man can hold property in man." Four millions yet remain to be delivered from the galling yoke of a worse than brutal servitude. Christians and patriots! can we do a nobler work, one more acceptable to God or more serviceable to our country and the world, than to "remember those in bonds as bound with them," and to labor "in season and out of season" for their emancipation?

Let unusual efforts be made by the members and friends of the Society to be present at the approaching anniversary, that there may be no lack of wise counsel and efficient cooperation with reference to the consummation of its great purpose.

In behalf of the Executive Committee,

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, *President*

WENDELL PHILLIPS, }
CHARLES C. BURLEIGH, } *Secretaries.*

☞ THE NEW YORK (CITY) ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY will hold its anniversary in the Cooper Institute on WEDNESDAY evening, May 8th. Addresses by WENDELL PHILLIPS and THEODORE TILTON. Admittance 10 cents, to defray expenses.

THE RIGHT OF SECESSION.

Last week, we published a letter from an anti-slavery correspondent at the West, taking umbrage at our denunciation of perfidy, robbery and treason, and affirming that we were not "intelligently conversant with their career," do not brand them in the same manner, as "traitors at heart, and doubly to be detested if they pretend to have any concern for the preservation of the Union." The writer, to our surprise, made our language personal to himself, and "drank God," (rather hotly,) that we were not his judge! Surely, he did not mean to justify the conduct of the seceding factionists: if he did, we have only to say that "he who abets the treason shares the crime" or if he denies that they have committed treason, then it is certain his political and ethical standard is wholly different from our own. But there must be some misunderstanding about this.

In another column, we have copied an editorial article from the *Anti-Slavery Bugle*, calling in question the soundness of our strictures, and defending the course pursued by the seceders, under the plea of "State Sovereignty." The deeds characterized by us as "crimes of gigantic magnitude, admitting of no extenuation or atonement," the *Bugle* says, "would appear in a somewhat different light, if viewed from another stand-point." No doubt much depends upon a stand-point in regard to what may be revealed; but in matters pertaining to justice, honesty, and fair-dealing, we were not aware of there being more than one stand-point, properly speaking. The *Bugle* adds:

"Suppose that, instead of ignoring State sovereignty, we recognize it, and freely admit, what Disunion abolitionists have always contended for—the *right* of a State to secede. This right being admitted, it is not for Massachusetts or Ohio to authoritatively indicate to South Carolina or Georgia as to how much provocation will justify them in seceding; they may leave the Union 'on a pretence or a suspicion of foul play,' or for any other reason they may choose to assign, or for no reason. None of these things affect the right of secession,—a right for which all Disunion abolitionists have consistently contended, until the Southern States have presumed to exercise it, not for the destruction of slavery, but for its perpetuation."

We did not know before, that "Disunion abolitionists have always [or ever] contended for the right of a State to secede," on whatever grounds it might choose to select, "without cause, and for no reason"; and we think the records of the Anti Slavery movement will be searched in vain to discover such a doctrine. Certainly, it is not a doctrine that has ever been advocated or countenanced by us; and we believe it to be wholly indefensible. Hence, when our pro-slavery opponents,—who disclaim what they are pleased to call the "ultraism" of the abolitionists, and pretend to be the most loyal of Unionists,—exceedingly represent us and the Southern "fire-eaters" as half-fellows, who are fraternally sinking hands with each other, it reveals to us either arrant hypocrisy on the one hand, or gross ignorance on the other. If the treason of the South is only the disunionism of the abolitionists,—as the *Bugle*, to our astonishment, seems to argue,—then we have never truly apprehended the latter, and henceforth must utterly eschew it. But we deny that there is any resemblance or analogy between them; we deny that, between what the perfidious secessionists have done, and what the abolitionists have urged upon the North to do in general, or any State in special, there is any point of comparison. The parties stand at antipodes in their ideas of government, moral obligation, human relationship, individual or "State sovereignty." To represent them as acting upon the same plane, and giving countenance to each other, is to confound broad and eternal distinctions.

The *Bugle*, "as a Disunion abolitionist, recognizes the sovereignty of each State, and its consequent right to withdraw from the Union *with or without cause.*" This is the doctrine of, and the defence made by the "fire-eaters," as against the General Government and the Constitution of the United States; but it is very significant, that no such right of secession is recognized in the Constitution of the Southern Confederacy, and that an attempt to secure its recognition was promptly voted down! Admit such a doctrine, and the Union is a rope of sand; agreements and pledges become worthless, because wholly baseless; the government is "neither here nor there." If, "without cause, and for no reason," any State may withdraw from the Union at any time, and seize upon whatever property it can find within its limits belonging to all the States under one general government, then there can be no fixed national policy, no reliable treaty-making power with other nations, no army or navy for the general defence, no sure national existence from one hour to another. At any moment, chaos may come again, and the elements "melt with fervent heat."

The *Bugle* says—"South Carolina, believing she had a right to secede, seceded." We cannot admit any such thing; for we have no idea that she honestly cherished such a belief. She knows that there is no justification for her conduct—none whatever. She has an infernal purpose to accomplish, and, therefore, she has no scruples in resorting to the meanest, basest, most perfidious, most treasonable measures in carrying it out. In nothing does she evince a consciousness of rectitude. The passions of her populace are "set on fire of hell"; a bloody despotism reigns throughout her borders; she is full of the habitations of cruelty; her pride is satanic, and her sway barbaric. She has always been a nuisance and a curse, demoniacally possessed, and ever loudly protesting that she was "tormented before her time." Where is her defence to be found? By what theory of government, worthy of the name, is she to be justified? We know not. To talk of "State sovereignty," in such a connection, is to us an absurdity. No "sovereignty" has a right to play the villain or buccaneer; to subvert the simplest rule of morality; to make a single dishonest appropriation; to perpetrate a single crime; unless, indeed, it is permissible to do evil on a gigantic scale that good may come.

Again the *Bugle* says—"As a sovereign State, it was a duty (!) she owed to herself to obtain possession of all fortifications which she justly supposed would or might be used to obstruct her in the exercise of that right." (!) So she herself declares; and she also inquires, in the language of the *Bugle*, "why should she not obstruct the collection of revenue of her people by another government, fire upon a national steamship, and endeavor to sink it, strike down the American flag, and run up a State flag of defiance in its stead," &c. &c. That is to say, having taken the first step downward, why should she not take the second, third, fourth, and so on, *ad infinitum*? We admit that her villany is symmetrical; but from its inception to its culmination, it is alike detestable and treacherous.

But, says the *Bugle*, "had Massachusetts seceded, she would probably have done the same thing." Then she would have been equally culpable. Two wrong-doers never yet made the wrong right.

As if anxious to exonerate South Carolina from all blame, the *Bugle* represents her as collecting the revenue, "not for treasonable purposes, but to defend herself against a government that had assumed the right to make her a *tributary province*"!—adding, "we recognize the sovereignty of the State as legitimate, rather than *the despotism of a central government*"! These imputations are warranted by nothing in the conduct of the general government towards South Carolina, or in their constitutional relations to each other. The former has never sought to make her "a tributary province," nor exercised any "despotism" over her. So far from this, it has up to this hour allowed her to have every thing her own way, and been as pliant as a wet rag in full view of her rapacious and treasonable acts! It has uttered no threats, it has fired no hostile gun, not even when its flag has been fired upon, it has not made a single arrest; it has tamely yielded to the forcible ejectment of its own legally appointed collectors of the customs, it has left the gallant Anderson and his little band to be hemmed in on all sides by hostile fortifications, and a foe more ferocious than savages, and more blood-thirsty than cannibals, it has "cried peace, peace, when there is no peace." We cannot conceive, therefore, what has got into the head of our Western coadjutor to make him regard South Carolina as acting on the defensive, and the general government as playing the despot over her! *It*, the wolf, and *she* the lamb!

[illegible] concludes its article as follows:—

"In maintaining the right of Southern States to secede as well as Northern States, we no more endorse as defensible, or reasonable, or just, the plea which they urge as the cause for secession, than we endorse the intemperance of a man who spends his wages in liquor, because we contend that he, as well as the sober man, is entitled to a day's wages for a day's work, and that, without reference to the reason that induces him to work, or the manner in which he spends his wages."

It seems to us that this refutes all that precedes it, and covers the ground we occupy. Carolina's plea of secession is neither "defensible," nor "reasonable," nor "just"—no more than "the intemperance of a man who spends his wages in liquor"! So we believe, so we affirm, and so we render judgment. But we do not see any pertinency of illustration, or analogy of reasoning, in the reference to the drunkard "being entitled to a day's wages for a day's work"—for we have never known that drunken Carolina has ever had any of her wages kept back on any pretence; on the contrary, she has constantly received vastly more than she has ever earned, and has always been a leech upon the national treasury—even now, though out of the Union as she declares, in common with the whole Southern Confederacy, meanly and fraudulently receiving her letters and papers at an enormous cost to the non-seceding States!

Respecting the stolen property, the *Bugle* says—"The Confederate States wish to arrange with the old government for an equitable division of property, and for the assumption of their portion of the public debt. What proposition could be fairer than this?" To this we reply, first, we have seen no satisfactory evidence of this. Second, these States are incapable of accepting "an equitable division of property," for nothing do they hate or contemn so much as equity. Third, they will never pay for anything they have stolen. Fourth, they will add immensely to the national debt, instead of assuming a single farthing of it. They are not to be trusted in any promise they may make, nor recognized as governed by the principles of honor. Theirs is "the blackest treason," and without a parallel in the annals of "rebellion."

But, says the *Bugle*—"None of these things affect the right of secession—*a right for which all Disunion abolitionists have consistently contended*, until the Southern States have presumed to exercise it, *not for the destruction of slavery, but FOR ITS PERPETUITY*." How can there be any "right" to do anything to perpetuate slavery? Whence does such a "right" originate? What "sovereignty" is competent to exercise it? And if the abolitionists use their right "for the destruction of slavery," does it follow that the slaveholders have an equal right to seek the perpetuity of "the sum of all villanies"? Is there no confusion of ideas here?

Of course, we attribute no intention of conniving at Southern villany on the part of our honored and long-tried coadjutor, whose *Bugle*-notes have hitherto been so clear and spirit-stirring, and whose standard has been so elevated and uncompromising; but we think he has strangely confounded Northern disunionism with Southern treason, by a false view of "State sovereignty," and thus been led to write an article far more befitting the columns of the Charleston *Mercury* than his own, excepting the last paragraph.

We shall show the difference between Northern Disunion and Southern Secession in another number.

THE METROPOLITAN POLICE BILL REJECTED. In the Senate on Monday, the bill of Mr. Whiting for the organization of a Metropolitan Police in the city of Boston was discussed at length, and rejected by a vote of 7 to 21. Those who voted right—i. e., in the affirmative—were Messrs Battles, Boynton, Clark, Day, Walden, Watson, Whiting. In the House, on Tuesday, a similar decision was arrived at. But this is only putting Mayor Wightman and the City Authorities on their good behavior for another year. If they shall suppress mob rule, very well; if not, another session of the Legislature will apply the remedy.

The Senate, on Tuesday, by the casting vote of the President, abolished the death penalty in this State. On Wednesday, the House non concurred—71 to 58.

THE "SABLE CLOUD."

Dr. South-side Adams has written a new book, of 275 pages, with the above title, designed to enforce the ideas suggested in his "South-Side View of Slavery." It is designed as a book of argument, but, the material for argument upon that side being rather scanty, the work is interwoven throughout with those appeals to the feelings which have given this author's devotional books such wide acceptance with his sect. Thus, *insinuation*, rather than argument, is the staple of the work. Dr. Adams is a Master in this art, practice having done much towards making him perfect, although this book is not the best specimen of his skill. Of course, no inherent difficulty in the subject intimidates him. Moreover, his writings in both departments take a South-side view of *truth*, placidly ignoring its limitations, and showing a thorough independence of them, both in rhetoric and argument. Thus it may well happen that Dr. Adams's parishioners, (and others who assume him to be trustworthy, and thus simply *receive*, without scrutiny or comparison, what he has written,) may find this book a very satisfactory one.

It opens with a letter—quite probably a real one—from the wife of a slaveholder, showing incidentally a genuine sympathy in some domestic affliction of some of her husband's slaves. It is just such a letter as Mrs. Shelby, in "Uncle Tom's Cabin," might have written, though it does not show so intelligent an appreciation as hers of the real welfare of the slave. It indicates feelings among some of the women of the South, the existence and the habitual manifestation of which have never been denied by abolitionists, and which have been repeatedly indicated by Mrs. Stowe in her and slavery tales, yet which do not in the slightest degree invalidate the representations made by that accurate delineator, and by the writers in these columns, of the very different disposition manifested by *the great majority* of slaveholders.

The purpose, however, of Dr. Adams, requires that he should misrepresent the abolitionists, and depreciate one of them so honored and so useful as Mrs. Stowe, and this he does with characteristic indirectness and disingenuousness.

In the second chapter, he delineates what he wishes to have understood as the impression received by an abolitionist from the sympathizing letter of the slaveholder's wife. Mr. A. Freeman North, the lay-figure whom he has manufactured to stand for an Anti-Slavery man, is sorely puzzled by this letter. He speculates whether there can possibly be one such woman in the South (although the letter itself indicates no preference for slavery, and might have been written by one who wished her husband to separate himself from it). Then he conjectures forgery, and scrutinizes the post-mark and hand-writing of the letter. Then he elaborately calls up the memories of "the old New York Tabernacle," of "the modern Boston Music Hall," of "Uncle Tom's Cabin," and of its "Key," in contrast, as if any of these had assumed such a letter to be impossible or improbable. Then he begins to doubt whether his abolitionist teachers have been correct, as if this invalidated their correctness. Then he assumes that, if this letter is believed, the great party of freedom must necessarily go to pieces, and "our Northern excitement against slavery cease," and begins to think if it can be suppressed. Then he falls into raptures over the novel idea that some slaves have actually liberty to—select one spot rather than another for the graves of their kindred—which is the portion of their felicity touched upon in this letter. Then he thinks of Paul's letter to Philemon, calling it—"a very trying epistle to us of the North." Then he utterly collapses under the remembrance of some expressions of humane feeling in the letter. Then he assumes that the abolitionists will tear and rend that beautiful letter, as a mad dog would "a cambric muslin handkerchief." And, in conclusion, partially recovering himself, he informs us that, though he disapproves the temper and language of the abolitionists, *who differ from him* [illegible] sympathizes with them "in their principles," and must continue to do so in spite of a thousand such letters.

Though much of the eulogy upon slavery in this book is insinuated rather than asserted, it is by no means a non-committal work. It goes thoroughly and heartily, not only for the continuance, but for the *extension* of slavery, and, in the course of the book, takes the following positions in regard to it:—

Dr. Adams assumes that the African race is an inferior race, that the slaveholding States present not only a Christian, but "a well-ordered state of society"; that the slaves of *pious* people—(a class represented by Frederick Douglass, who had a varied experience in slavery, as the most oppressive class of masters)—"are better off than any separate class of laboring people on earth"; that setting the slaves free at once "would be as unjust to them as it originally was to steal them from Africa"; that "ownership in man" is neither wrong in itself, nor likely to come to an end, while this world lasts; that slavery in this land has now "the prospect of being more firmly established than ever by means of our great national commotion on this subject"; that to hire the slaves as free laborers "would make them a far more degraded people than they now are"; that "the South, and their present relation to the white race, are the bounds of their habitation fixed for them by an all-wise God"; that if the slaves were made free, "they would fall into a degraded, serf-like condition—*but now each of them partakes of his master's interests, and rises with him*"; that, "the colored people being here, their being *owned* is the very best possible thing for their protection"; that "there is no form or condition of service in the world which has more effect than slavery to keep families together"; that those Northern men who, *like himself*, belong to a denomination in which many eminent clergymen have fallen into the sin of licentiousness, should never "cast a stone at the South on that subject,"—since "their clergy, their husbands, their young men, if they are no better, *are not worse than we*"; that the *ownership* of men and women which he has been defending, is accurately thus defined—it is "a right to use, and to dispose of, the services of another, *wholly at my will*"; that even the application of the Golden Rule to the blacks does not require that we regard them as "on a level with us"; that "if the South could be relieved of Northern interference, the condition of the colored people would be greatly improved"; that "the only remedy is the entire abandonment by the North, of interference with this subject"; yet that "this cannot take place so long as the Northern people labor under their doctrinal error that it is a sin to hold property in man"; that, considering the prevalence of this error in the North, it is a very remarkable providential arrangement "that one book of the Bible, which was to be made known to all nations by the commandment of the everlasting God, for the obedience of faith, should be exclusively on the subject of slavery, and that the whole burden of the Epistle should be, The Rendition of a Fugitive Slave!"—that God "ordains the subjection of one race to another, and *makes bondage one of His ordinances as truly as war*;" that one beneficial effect of slavery upon the masters is shown in the Southern gentleman's "reverence for the female sex"; and, that, as to the slave, his "abounding sustenance" solves the great problem which has always puzzled political economists and publicists ("how to feed the lower classes")—and that he is, moreover, "as thoroughly protected as any laborer in Europe! He is protected from every other man's wrong-doing by the ready interference of his master; he is guarded from the master's abuse by the laws of the land, and a vigilant, earnest public opinion."

The above is only a gleaning from the abundant harvest of thorough and hearty advocacy of slavery contained in this book. Some further expressions of it will be noticed in another article.—C. K. W.

☞ "*What have the Abolitionists done?*" Answer—read Secretary Floyd's admissions on our first page.

THE LATEST NEWS FROM ST. DOMINGO.

HAYTIAN BUREAU OF EMIGRATION, }
BOSTON, April 1st, 1861. }

To the Editor of the Tribune:

SIR—I find in all the dispatches of the associated press, the following paragraph about Hayti and St. Domingo:—

"Great excitement existed in Havana on the subject of the Spanish annexation of St. Domingo. It appears that, during some time past, a process of colonization has been going on, by the introduction of large bodies of emigrants into the island, with the view of promoting Spanish interests, and consequent disaffection towards the republican government, and, at the first sign of existence on the part of the native population, to invoke the aid of the Spanish government. This was accomplished on the 16th inst., when the Spanish flag was hoisted, much to the consternation of the black and native inhabitants. The Spanish frigate Basca was dispatched from Havana on the 23d, immediately on the receipt of the above news, fully manned and equipped, with a large number of regular troops on board, to assist in this Spanish protectorate, or, in other words, annexation.

The screw steam frigates Petronella and Barenguela were to follow as soon as possible, with about 6000 of the regular army. A large additional naval and military force, including some of the largest war vessels, and about 10,000 regular troops, is also reported as on the way from Spain to Cuba and the West Indies. By an arrangement with France, already consummated, it is said that Hayti is to share the fate of its sister republic."

This news is capable of an explanation, at once truthful and less alarming than the comments of the New York *Daily Times*, and the letter of your Havana correspondent.

As a vast majority of our citizens know nothing about Hayti and the Dominican Republic, excepting that both are inhabited by people of African descent, it may be necessary to state, that the island of St. Domingo, or Hispaniola or Hayti, is held by two independent nationalities; that of the eastern part being known as the Dominican Republic, or oftener St. Domingo, or more frequently the Spanish part, and that of the west, (formerly called the French part,) being known as the Republic of Hayti. In the Dominican Republic, which has a population of 120,000, the people, who are chiefly mulattoes, talk Spanish, and were formerly subjects of Spain. Their ruler is President SANTANA, a man nearly white, whose sympathies, ideas and tendencies have all, and always, favored a re-union of his country to the unmotherly mother, the empire of Spain. In Hayti, which has a population variously estimated at from 100,000 to 120,000, the people speak French; they are the descendants of slaves, and of free colored people, who succeeded in throwing off the French domination. Their ruler is President GEFFRARD, who represents in his blood the three original races,—Indian, black and white,—and whose earnest aim is to establish a powerful independent nationality, to be exclusively composed of men of African descent.

The Eastern part, or the Dominican Republic, was conquered by Toussaint L'Ouverture, having been previously ceded to France by Spain, under the treaty of Basle, but never formally delivered over to that power. Toussaint had not quite completed its subjugation, when Le Clerc's expedition arrived, and recalled him to the West. During the war between the Haytians and the French, which followed the disembarkment of these troops of Napoleon, (who were sent to reenslave the blacks, and were ignominiously defeated in the attempt,) the Eastern part was again put under the power of Spain, and was thus held till 1821, when a revolution overthrew its authority.

In 1822, the Eastern part was united to Hayti, then governed by President Boyer. For twenty-two years the whole island acknowledged his authority. On his overthrow, in 1844, the Dominicans "seceded," and no "reconstruction" with either Spain or Hayti has as yet been effected.

Since the independence of the Dominican Republic, two parties have divided and alternately governed it, whose representative men are Santana and Baez, as the words reunion and independence indicate their respective politics.

Unlike Cæsar, Santana would rather be a little man in a great country, than a great man in a little country. Twice he has formally offered to place the Dominican Republic under the Spanish crown; and failing to these attempts, he coquetted for a similar purpose with France, and then for a confederate union with Venezuela. But none of the powers would accept his proposals. France and Spain had been bitten once, and were satisfied with that experience, and Venezuela did not want to be bitten at all. His last desperate effort was to induce a white emigration from the United States; but, although seconded by our Consuls there, (whose longer continuance in office will be disgraceful to our Republican Administration,) he signally failed to interest either our capitalists or laborers to the project.

Some years ago—what I say now is drawn from Haytian official sources—Santana borrowed a million of dollars from Spain. Failing to repay it according to the terms of the loan, he offered to give a mortgage on the Custom Houses. Last summer, accordingly, a small band of Spaniards—not more than eighty in all—arrived at St. Domingo, and three officials among them immediately entered on their duties as collectors at the ports. The rest were mechanics. That is *all* the "emigration" that has been sent to the Dominican Republic by Spain. There has been a small emigration from South America; but this tide, with its flux and reflux, is as old as the independence of the Spanish colonies; for, whenever there is a revolution in Venezuela, or the adjoining countries, numbers of the banished seek a home in the Dominican Republic.

This policy of Santana furnished the material for creating an effective union among the opposition to his government. "*See! he is selling the country to the whites!*" Even as early as last December, revolutionary circulars and proclamations were in type in St. Domingo; and a copy of the proofs, I know, were shown to a distinguished ambassador at Paris. But this project was nipped in the bud; and Baez is still an exile. The intrigues of the opposition continuing and increasing, Santana has called for aid—first, in order to secure the perpetuity of his own government, and secondly, to enable him to repay the loan.

This, I venture to say, is "the sum total of the whole" hubbub that we hear from Havana.

These facts being unknown to the reporters of the Associated Press and the Cuba correspondents, it is not astonishing that they should *surmise*, (it is given only as a supposition,) that France would seize Hayti, as they think that Spain has seized the Dominican Republic. The notion that Haytians would then be re-enslaved would be quite pathetic, if it were not quite so absurd.

There are various reasons why France will never threaten Hayti—among them, these:—

She has recognized the independence of Hayti.

She draws a large revenue from Hayti, as her payment for recognizing that independence.

She is bound by treaty to defend Hayti against all foreign attacks; and, lastly,

She could not attack Hayti without first declaring war against England.

I might add to these reasons two others—first, that the experience of Napoleon, called the Great, conclusively proves that France could not conquer Hayti, if she were to try; and, secondly, that Napoleon, called the Little, is too shrewd a statesman to voluntarily attempt to defy the moral sentiment of Christendom, and the physical power of England combined, when, even if he were successful in conquering both, the possession of Hayti would not begin to balance the expenses of governing it. Algiers, near at hand, Madagascar, easy of conquest, are more inviting fields for his ambition than Hayti, the cemetery of the flower of his uncle's greatest army.

I have also official authority for stating that, last January, England and France offered to be the mediators of a treaty of alliance and of defence between Hayti and the Dominican Republic, *by which the integrity of the Territory of both countries against all foreign powers is guaranteed.*

The proposition was accepted; Commissioners

named to conclude the treaty; and, when it is signed, France and England stand pledged to enforce it.

But, even if France did not stand thus pledged, is it likely that England would permit her to seize Hayti, in violation of the laws of nations, and of her own treaty stipulations! Never! For Hayti, in the hands of a first class power, would command the Gulf; and the Molo St. Nicholas, by the expenditure of a few thousands of dollars, could easily be made a second Gibraltar. England would not permit her trade with Jamaica to be thus imperilled.

Again. Napoleon, although a traitor and a perjurer, is a far-sighted ruler. He knows the American people, and does not care to rouse them. He knows, too, that events are far stronger than articles, and that, although our President's hands may now be tied by the Constitution, and treason flourish in consequence thereof, yet circumstances may compel him to appeal to the North, which, once unshackled, would sweep with the besom of destruction all the Cotton States into the Gulf, at a quicker rate than Christ drove the devils (who seceded into swine) into the sea.

Respectfully, JAMES REDPATH.

SOUTHERN SOCIETY AND GOVERNMENT.

It is curious to notice the many attempts made by prominent men in the South to argue out the divinity which, it is alleged, gave inspiration to slavery. Fancies as numerous as winged insects in mid-summer seem to play about the Southern brain. The defence of slavery at the South is no less an institution than slavery itself, and Southern wit has taxed its utmost energies to shield the conscience against the censure of frowning humanity.

Once slavery was but a bud which the best honestly believed would drop from the parent stock ere it could mature. Contrary to expectation, it bloomed and ripened into bitter fruit. Once it was only to be tolerated even by its supporters; now it is to be made essential to the existence of the highest form of society. Once a hateful hag, hell-born; now a seraph robed in light. Once but the harsh clash of capital and labor, now the strong arm of friend and benefactor, stretching over the unfortunate; majestic strength weeping over ill-proportioned weakness; Christian and heathen, superior and inferior, as ordained of God, European and African, master and slave, in beautiful juxtaposition!

In the attempt to convince themselves and the world that this delightful conclusion comes legitimately of reason, all disturbing forces in the process must be removed. Democracy must be carefully eliminated. Ideas of popular sovereignty must be cast out, that the relation so natural between white and black shall be more completely harmonized. Mr. Spratt, in his plea for the legalization of the slave trade of South Carolina, says one white master answers to one African slave, and cancels the democratic element which conflicts so mercilessly with the best form of society. One million of white, and half this number of black men, will not do. The first approach to perfection is equality in number. The next step is to increase the proportion of blacks at pleasure, till at length the great and glorious Southern Confederacy, ultimately to be established somewhere under a tropical sun, may amount to forty millions. This number of African slaves, with only a million of masters, would be a model community, once freed from a disorganizing democracy. The proposition is simply, that there shall be as many or more slaves than masters.

Having settled upon this for a social system—a result of the efforts of nature—the next step is to erect the political system. Based as the State is on this nice adjustment, so fruitful of good economy and so productive of wealth, circumstances are, of course, favorable to the birth and growth of a model class of men. Wealth and leisure insure the high culture of the best-born, and hence comes a legitimate aristocracy, out of which are to flow elegance, fashion, refinement, and the governing power. The less fortunate of birth and rank, though none the less masters and protectors of the unfortunate slaves within their own precincts, are naturally doomed to be governed; and thus, in this glorious confederacy, we get a reproduction of the patrician, plebeian and slave.

It is to be observed that no thought of freedom to the slave is ever to be indulged for a moment. Master and slave—this is Heaven-ordained. This we are to take for granted, as the basis on which the whole structure is to rest. Not so much as a hint of the lack of a support of capital, or the possibility that labor can exist in any other form than that of slave. One is tempted to demand proof of the premises, before proceeding to read the argument.

Of course, it does not lie within the province of this school of political economists and philosophers to consider the moral aspect of this state of things; the simple assumption is, that Africans are inevitably and essentially slaves, and the great mass of white men, though masters of slaves, must be ruled by a governing class, who enjoy the prerogative of holding and dispensing rights at will. It is not even hinted that there is any possibility that the *status* of the slave can ever be changed. His office, like a foundation-wall, consists in perpetually imbedding himself, and all his natural rights, to form a support to the political structure which is ever to rest on it. Slavery is the hand; the mass of white men the directing head. The governing class, high up and aloof, uses the latter as means to its own princely support.

Golden visions like this float over the imaginations of prominent secessionists, and shape their action. Not, as they say, to be practically carried out till they not only dissolve their connection with the North by the present revolution, but by the expulsion of democracy from among themselves by still another revolution—a necessary labor to be performed before this model society can stand erect.

The difficulty with this school of politicians is, that they start on assumption and fallacy. They have never dreamed of proving their premises. They pretend to logic and philosophy, but, the truth is, they are only special pleaders. They have trained their intellects so long in the service of Southern statute law, and the peculiar property which it protects, and self-will has become so strong by possession of irresponsible power—to domineer is so fixed a habit—it is impossible that the possessors should be able to form any just view of either a social or political system that shall not owe its excellence to the degradation of the mass of the people. Born and brought up under a system which tolerates an unbounded exercise of mere selfish power over the weak, must surely unfit the mind for a rational investigation of the principles of social and political science. By aid of such perverted mental vision, facts as they exist cannot, in the first place, be properly perceived, much less can any theories arising from such a source be worthy the attention of thinkers. Such a cast of habit and thought must necessarily culminate in a tyrannical nature, and any government conceived in such a spirit must necessarily be despotic. They give us fancies for facts. So well trained are they to the art of convincing an opponent, that, having secured your assent to the first position, they will reason you with lightning speed to every point of the compass, and make you stick fast in the mire. These are the men who, by every disgraceful means, plot the overthrow of the United States Government, because they can no longer manage it; and demand its complete humiliation, that they and their insane theories may rise above its ruins. How far they will succeed remains to be seen.

With such divergent views between the two sections of the country, how can any rational man indulge the hope that there can, by any possibility, be anything like a union among us! Between the Free and Slave States, there are two essentially opposite and conflicting ideas, and all the powers in earth and hell cannot reconcile them. *One or the other must finally triumph. Which shall it be?* W.

☞ We conclude, this week, the very able dissertation of Karl Heinzen, entitled "The People and the State; or, the Unitarian State and the Federative State." Read it carefully. [See our last page.]

ADDRESS TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

Taking it for granted that the District of Columbia is forever abandoned as the capital of the nation, allowing that several of the States have seceded from the Union, two questions will arise in the public mind.

First—Shall the remaining States be loyal to the Constitution, and shall they enter into negotiations with the seceded States, and recognize under certain stipulations their withdrawal from the Union? Or,

Second—Shall the old confederation make war upon and force the new republic, monarchy, or whatever it may be, to submit to its terms, and acknowledge the superiority of its national power?

To answer these questions concisely, it must be borne in mind that there is no natural basis of union between the two sections. One is interested in the maintenance of free labor, and the other must, for a season at least, use forced or slave labor. These must war with one another—both cannot exist together. One belongs to the South, the other to the North. The interests of the employers are, and forever must be, diverse; and as one lives, thrives, and comes into power, the other is weakened, languishes, and dies. It is clear to every intelligent political economist what the fate of the slave institution is. Heaven cannot smile upon them. "God has no attribute which can take sides with the slaveholder."

No doubt the defenders of the slave system expect to perpetuate it by secession; but all efforts in that direction must fail to meet the end aimed at. The dissolution of the American Union is the destruction of the slave system. This being so, every lover of his kind must rejoice that an event so desirable is at the door. Let it come—the sooner the better. It should be urged on, rather than retarded, by all who have the welfare of the poor and oppressed at heart. True union is desirable. Peace should be sought; but these great blessings must not be placed above eternal justice. Justice must be done, let the cost be what it may. "Let the Union slide," then, without anxiety, without a tear. It is an event that must come. Better now than at a later day. The fathers should not leave this work to their children. They will have enough to do in their time, for the question of peaceable secession is to start other political, moral and religious questions. Disunion has come in the best time, and in Heaven's appointed way. The North does not leave the South, but the latter withdraws from the former. But the South does not choose to go out of the Union poor. She seizes upon the national forts, arsenals, navy yards, ships of war, and the Southern mint does not escape her notice. What shall be done? Shall the North fight for these, and drench American soil with blood? By no means. Let the South have what she has seized, and let her bear all the ignominy which shall be heaped upon her by all the nations of the earth. From this hour, let it be seen that she is not only guilty of piracy, but that she has seized upon property held in common by the family of States; and, in time, she will see herself as others see her. If the nations of the earth make war upon her in her weak, distracted state, she cannot reasonably expect assistance from those she has robbed, and it is quite certain that the North would be in no haste to return the slave to his master, even though a case were sustained on the plea that "labor or service was due."

But if the South has left the Union, where is the Federal Government? Has it an existence? Where are its courts? Where its navigable rivers? Where its custom houses? Where its capital? Where its post office? And of what use can the potent laws hereafter be? The whole thing has virtually fallen to pieces. There is no Constitution, and there is no geographical union of the nation; it is but a rope of sand. National chaos has come. Lincoln cannot be regarded as the President of the United States. Congress cannot act, and the Capital must be forever forsaken. But what if these things are so? Are there not skill, wisdom, and a deep love of union sufficient to construct a new and a better government than any that now exists on this earth? Let the trial be made. The President elect is without power, without a dollar to sustain his government. The American treasury is at this moment bankrupt. The Union, so called, cannot pay its honest debts. Sherman may seek to replenish it, but who cares to advance money now? Seward, Hale, Crittenden, Adams and Sumner would be paupers to-day, had they not private resources on which to draw. There is nothing, then, to expect from the old Union. The work to be done is to construct a new and a NORTHERN REPUBLIC, and that Republic must omit, in all its basis papers, both the words *male* and *white*, else it will be a weak, rickety thing, and will "fall asunder like flax at the touch of fire." Neither women nor negroes will much longer submit to laws that they do not frame; neither will they consent to pay taxes while they are shut off from the ballot-box.

Men of all colors being admitted to an equality of right, it being agreed that woman shall take her place in the councils of the nation, there may be procedure to issue a declaration of sentiments. That work could be better done by WM. LLOYD GARRISON than by any other American writer. When a Declaration is agreed on, it will not be difficult to frame a Constitution. Charles Sumner, Wm. H. Seward, assisted by Bates of Missouri, could do that work in less than a month from the time it was committed to their hands. As for the post office, the Government need take no trouble about that. Adams, with his vast express machinery, would take due care of that. He now runs his express in less than four days from New Orleans to New York, while the United States mail covers seven days. There is no good reason why the American people should not send all their packages and letters to suit themselves, without let or hindrance from the Government. As for the patent office, it has become a most oppressive monopoly, and should be abolished; and the shrewd inventor will manage his own affairs without protection from the nation. The custom house will not be wanted—trade will be free—taxation will be direct—and the harbors requiring light-houses or fight-boats will be supplied by the States which need them. In short, much of the machinery that was needful to the old confederation will not be called for by the new. In a future number, I shall take opportunity to speak of the structure of a government, such as the world now needs.

S. M. J.

THE WESTERN FIELD.

BOURBON, (Ind.) March 27, 1861.

TO THE EDITOR:

Marshall and Kosciusko counties, where I have spent the last month, were, thirty years ago, an unbroken wilderness, inhabited by a remnant of the tribe of Miamis, who have disappeared before the white man's civilization, with the exception of one neighborhood, seven or eight miles in extent, now under the culture of the Baptist Home Missionary Society. These Indians are sober, honest and kind. They are thrifty, but I am told have no interest in American politics.

The soil of this part of the State of Indiana is superior to any I have seen, supporting, in great abundance, large and healthy timber, mostly oak, walnut and poplar. It is not uncommon to see poplars sixty feet high, without limbs. The railroad (Chicago, Fort Wayne and Pittsburg) gives these new settlers an advantage over their neighbors, as they can sell, instead of burning, all their timber. The oaks are carried at full length, for ship timber, and the walnut goes east, for furniture. I am told that Warsaw, the county seat of Kosciusko, ships on the road more lumber than any other town between Chicago and Pittsburg.

The farmers already raise cattle and grain in abundance, have tolerably fencing and passable roads, but few good houses and orchards.

The school system, if indeed there is such a system here, is wretchedly incomplete; owing in part to the bankrupt condition of the State treasury, and, in other respects, to the inappreciation of education among the people. The State of Indiana has recorded a striking lesson of the dominance of a few ignorant, jobbing politicians, who, to carry on "Internal Improvements"—*internal* to the pockets of the few, but impoverishing to the purses of the many—involved the State in heavy liabilities, from which, though she has sold part of those improvements, as she had before disposed of most of her credit, she is not yet able to extricate herself, and will remain tethered to the ground, until the energies of the people develop from their own hidden resources a system of politics in which common honesty is not wholly ignored.

In these counties they have common schools six or eight months in the year, and the loss of the high school is in part made up by literary and lyceum associations, in which manhood as well as mind receives culture. Among the young men of these associations are minds that would be creditable to a much older country, before whom superstition and error will ere long lose its authority. Already the hungry horde of ministers besetting this new country—a questionable exchange for those other beasts of (prey) prey that fled before the face of man—tremble at the personal independence asserted by these associations.

But when you get beyond the lyceum, the only free institution in our country, you have seen the sunset of civilization.

Within five miles of Warsaw, the capital of the county where I last week held a meeting, before inviting me to her hospitality, the hostess inquired, aside, whether or not I was a *woman*. "They say," said she, "no *woman* ever talked as she talks, and I never knew one talk at all." She was terribly religious.

In discussing the question of amending the Constitution, to authorize the abolition of slavery, at Etna Green, a Jack-at-a-pinch Justice refused to vote in its favor, because, he said, he had "taken his stand on the Chicago platform, the platform of the Fathers, and the platform of non-intervention"! I was told that, in view of his ponderous public functions, he practised elocution, previous to his election, in the old Demosthenean style. Standing upon the bank of a deserted mill-pond, he challenged the ancestral knights of Frogdom in this wise: "Fellow-Citizens, Frogs of both sexes—In the name of the Constitution and of the Chicago platform, I have a right to be heard." My informant says it was a dreadful encounter, but the meed was won, and the loyal knights have not yet peeped."

At Plymouth, county seat of Marshall county, the Methodist minister asked an interest in the prayers of his church for Mr. Lincoln. The pro-slavery Democrats took it in high dudgeon, and seriously proposed to withdraw. The church was refused for an anti-slavery meeting, on the ground that they "have already disturbance enough."

The editor of the Republican paper here was requested to publish J. R. Giddings's article on "The Fugitive at Cleveland;" and though he is prodigiously anti-slavery, no notice of this, or of the anti-slavery meeting, has yet appeared. His column of "Local News" shows, however, that he has an acute eye to small things.

At a meeting in the Methodist Church at Bourbon, the circuit minister uttered his solemn protest against political meetings on the Lord's day, and in the house of God, and declared himself shocked and amazed at the mixing up of the names of Jesus and Seward in the pulpit. A vote to amend the Constitution so as to authorize Congress to abolish slavery passed unanimously over the head of this pious Democrat, supported by his brothers in the ministry, several of whom were present, and his church generally, including class leaders and new converts. The itinerant system is, to this minister, his only forlorn hope.

The local preacher of Franklin refused the use of the Methodist church, last evening, as, he said, several of the members "believe slavery is right"; and the minister declared he would take up arms sooner than abolish slavery, and allow the "*niggers*" to come to Indiana. The large school-house was opened, and many who could not come in, heard through the open windows.

The state of the weather and of the roads has nothing to do with audiences here. The Government and the Church are in a siege against humanity, and the people, who know it, are invulnerable.

The flying visit of that able and faithful advocate of unconditional emancipation, Marius R. Robinson, has left an indelible impression upon this community. The doctrine of Disunion, which he taught as a means to abolish slavery, has with this people so little terror, that scarcely a man can be found to deny the right of the South to secede, while I hear many declare that they would shoulder a musket to prevent her return.

I have thrown together these few incidents of a month to give you a just idea of an average aspect of the great Northwest. But, most important for your notice is the fact, that in nearly every meeting that has been held in these two counties, the people have given almost unanimous and enthusiastic votes in favor of abolishing slavery in the States as well as in the Territories—and have largely signed the petition to amend the Constitution accordingly.

Agents are here, receiving generous contributions for suffering Kansas. There is a great mania here for building churches, and funds are being raised for a College in Marshall county. The people in this new country earn their money, and have but little of it. In view of all these difficulties, my collections are small. A few have been induced to take anti-slavery papers, and I am sure a month here has not been misapplied, and so thinks Elisha Erwin, the standard-bearer here.

Truly, JOSEPHINE S. GRIFFING.

TWELVE SERMONS, delivered at Antioch College, by HORACE MANN. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1861.

The sermons constituting this neatly printed volume were written and delivered while Mr. Mann was President of Antioch College. They embrace the following topics:—1. God's Being, the Foundation of Human Duty. 2. God's Character, the Law of Human Duty. 3. God's Law, the Principle of Spiritual Liberty. 4. Sin, the Transgression of the Law. 5. Testimony against Evil a Duty. 6 and 7. The Prodigal Son. 8. Temptation. 9. Retribution. 10. The Kingdom of Heaven. 11. Immortality. 12. Miracles. They are all highly instructive, and exhibit that copiousness and felicity of illustration, that closeness of reasoning, and that power of expression, which characterized nearly all that came from the pen of Mr. Mann, whether occupying the arena of political life, the office of Secretary of the Board of Education, or his last position as the President of Antioch College. This publication is a solid service rendered to the cause of religion and morality.

THE STRUGGLE OF THE HOUR: A Discourse delivered at the Paine Celebration in Cincinnati, January 29, 1861. By Orson S. Murray.

This Discourse, with an Appendix, occupies 68 octavo pages. It relates mainly to the tremendous conflict between Freedom and Slavery now going on in the land, and deals with men and institutions in a bold and scathing manner. Particular attention is paid to William H. Seward and his whiffling policy since the election of Abraham Lincoln, and the lash applied with merited severity. For a long time we have read nothing more racy or pungent. We shall find room for some extracts hereafter. In the earliest and most trying period of the Anti-Slavery cause, Mr. Murray—first as a Baptist minister, next as an editor of a Baptist journal—was for several years conspicuous in it, doing it "yeoman service," both with his pen and voice. Since then, he has passed through various "dispensations"; but, however eccentric or divergent his course, or conflicting or startling his abstract speculations, he has always exhibited manly independence, a disposition fearlessly to "prove all things," and a humane and liberty-loving spirit. It is a long time since he has spoken so directly and strongly upon this subject, the abolition of all 'gods' having occupied his attention more than the abolition of chattel slavery. He is always earnest and sincere.

MASSACHUSETTS LEGISLATURE.

FEDERAL RELATIONS.

Majority and Minority Reports on Amending the Federal Constitution.

A RESOLVE FOR A NATIONAL CONVENTION.

The Committee on Federal Relations, to whom were referred the resolves of the General Assembly of Indiana, proposing a National Convention, reported the following resolve:—

Resolved, That while we regard the Constitution of the United States, if properly interpreted and duly enforced, as amply sufficient to secure the just rights of the people of all the States of the Union, still, as dissatisfaction and misunderstanding have arisen, respecting the proper interpretation of that instrument, the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to call a Convention of the several States, in accordance with the 5th article of the Constitution thereof, to take into consideration the propriety of amending the same, so that its meaning may be definitely understood, in all sections of the Union.

The Committee on Federal Relations, to whom was referred a resolve of the Congress of the United States, approved March 2d, 1861, entitled "Joint Resolution to Amend the Constitution of the United States," reported as follows:—

REPORT.

The proposed amendment is as follows:—

"No amendment shall be made to the Constitution which will authorize or give to Congress the power to abolish or interfere within any State with the domestic institutions thereof, including that of persons held to labor or service, by the laws of said State."

The principles upon which the General Government was established are well understood. It was intended for the general purposes of protection to the several States within its jurisdiction, leaving to the individual States all powers of sovereignty and rights of legislation not necessary to the objects for which that Government was instituted. Included in the rights thus reserved to the States, is the absolute control over all their domestic institutions. This is evident from the letter and spirit of the Constitution. It is universally admitted that the several States have exclusive jurisdiction over the system of involuntary servitude within their respective limits. Under the Constitution of the United States, the General Government has no authority over, or responsibility for, the existence of slavery in the United States, and no State has the right, in any manner, to interfere with the system in any other State. The States upon this subject are as much independent of each other as they would have been had the people not delegated any power of sovereignty to the General Government. Massachusetts has no more authority over slavery in South Carolina than she has over any domestic institution of any nation in Europe, and consequently has no responsibility for its continued existence. The Committee believe that the people of Massachusetts, and of the other free States, concur in these opinions. But it is evident that these opinions are misunderstood by many people in the slave States, and it was undoubtedly for the purpose of removing all doubts and cause of dissatisfaction upon this subject that this amendment to the Constitution has been proposed by Congress, and submitted to the Legislatures of the several States for their ratification or rejection. But in the opinion of the Committee, due deference to the people requires that it should not be passed upon by the Legislature, without an opportunity being given for an expression of the popular will of the same; and as this amendment has been proposed since the election of the members of the present Legislature, and as the public exigencies in their opinion do not require an immediate decision, they prefer that the question should be determined by a Legislature elected with a knowledge of the people of the pendency of the question. The Committee are, also, of opinion that the better mode of considering amendments to the Constitution is through the instrumentality of a National Convention. They have accordingly reported a resolution, requesting Congress to call a Convention of the several States for the purpose of considering the propriety of amending the Constitution so that its meaning may be definitely understood in all sections of the Union. If such a Convention shall be called, it will supersede the necessity of any action upon the proposed amendment by the Legislature. The Committee would therefore recommend the reference of the subject to the next General Court.

Senate: WM. D. NORTHEND, GEO. T. DAVIS,
House: J. F. PHILLIPS, P. H. BURNHAM,
Committee.

MINORITY REPORT.

During the last few months, the aims and intentions of the Slave Power have been more fully developed than at any former period. It is now clear to every unprejudiced mind that this power either intends to possess the Government of these United States or to annihilate it. The Free States have conceded to the claims of slavery time after time for the last forty years, and yielded point after point under the plausible term "compromise." Every new concession has paved the way for a new demand. Every new demand has been, at first, boldly resisted as a thing too unjust to be listened to, then it has been feebly argued for on the score of policy, and finally submitted to as a necessity, for the sake of peace. The Missouri Compromise in 1820 was forced upon the reluctant North by threats and bravado. The annexation of Texas, and the consequent Mexican war, were also forced upon us by the Slave Power. Then followed the finality measures of 1850, the legalizing of slavery in Utah and New Mexico, and that gentle infliction upon a Christian community, the Fugitive Slave Act,—a compromise on the part of freedom, where power was the thing given, and degradation the equivalent received. Then followed the era of assumptions, the Kansas and Nebraska Bill, the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and the claiming of the opinion of the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott case as a decision. None of these measures has the Slave Power attempted to justify as compromises. They are all high-handed assumptions, forced by a factious minority upon a timid and yielding majority.

Some years ago, Massachusetts asked the Slave States to grant her a hearing in their Courts, in respect to the constitutionality of those laws by which they claimed the right to search our coasting vessels and imprison our citizen sailors. What was the result? They drove back our agents unheard, by threats, reproaches and insults. The Slave Power commands us to modify our Personal Liberty Law, and forthwith we modify it. Thus have we gone on conceding, yielding, submitting, till we have become bankrupt, till we have nothing more to yield outside of the Constitution. Hence we are required to commence the work of demolition upon the Constitution itself. The Constitution of the United States is the work of our revolutionary fathers. It was framed, as its preamble asserts, to establish justice, and secure the blessings of liberty. Although the institution of slavery existed in some of the States at the time of the formation of this Constitution, yet so perfect is its construction, that slavery might utterly fade out, in every State of the Union, and still every provision of this skilfully drawn instrument be needed for the government of free and confederate States. The future historian will search the letter of the Constitution, in vain, to find a line that necessarily implies that man can, under its provisions, lawfully hold property in man. The Constitution of the United States was the result of mutual concessions on the part of the different States confederated under it. The people of this Union have been taught by the leading statesmen of all parties, to regard the Constitution as sacred. The Democratic party, especially, have claimed it as the very palladium of our liberties. The Supreme Court of the United States has been regarded as the authoritative expounder of controverted constitutional provisions, and its decisions have ever been acquiesced in with deferential respect, by Massachusetts, whether these decisions coincided with her State policy and interest, or otherwise; whilst on the contrary, the Slave States have been willing to submit to the decisions of the Court, only when such decisions were supposed to favor their own peculiar State policy and interest.

Under this Constitution, the country has prospered in a degree heretofore unparalleled in the history of the race. Our Democratic friends, whilst in power, professed to regard the Constitution of the United States as the most perfect instrument of government that ever had been or ever would be framed and put into operation by the wisdom and ingenuity of man. Their greatest fear seemed to be that the Republicans, on the other hand, vied with the Democrats, in asserting their veneration for the Constitution, and their sacred regard for its provisions. The sectional party, organized and controlled by the Slave Power, was defeated, last November, by the popular vote which elected Mr. Lincoln to the Presidency of the United States. Mr. Lincoln was known to be a believer in the great truths of the Declaration of Independence. He was also known to be a disbeliever in the practical maxim of the Slave Power, to wit:—that slavery is the corner stone of our Republican institutions, and that the chief duty of the General Government is to extend the domain of slavery. Suddenly, a change is wrought in the views of almost an entire political party. The Constitution that had been proclaimed to be so sound, so fit and proper to be administered by the Slave Power, is now regarded as an instrument dangerous and unfit to be administered by a Republican President. The Constitution must be remodelled, new guarantees must be given to the slave interests, or the Union must be dissolved. And though Congress has tened with unwonted zeal to appoint compromise and concession committees, and Virginia called a Peace Convention of the States—yet, State after State raised the standard of rebellion, till seven States had seceded, and six of these seven had proclaimed themselves organized under a new confederacy, and now stands with arms in hand, defiant to the Government and the Constitution of the United States. Under these circumstances, Congress, by a constitutional majority, asks the States to pass a vote upon the following proposed amendment to the Constitution. * * * * * * [See the foregoing part of the majority report.]

The undersigned feel that there are serious objections to the adoption of this proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, a few of which they beg leave briefly to state. First. It introduces a new feature into the Constitution itself. Our fathers believed the human race to be progressive, and hence left every part of the Constitution open to amendment. The proposed amendment, if adopted, makes the Constitution unalterable in one of its provisions, at least. Second. The term, "domestic institutions," is very broad in its meaning, embracing institutions educational, reformatory, and retrogressive. Suppose, for instance, some State should fall so far back into barbarism as to adopt a system of cannibalism or polygamy, would a Christian nation bind itself never to interfere with such "domestic institutions"? Third. This is no time to initiate constitutional amendments, when several of the States stand in the attitude of rebellion to the Constitution itself. Fourth. Massachusetts has ever been faithful to the Constitution of the United States, and intends to be faithful to all its provisions. Her self-respect, therefore, forbids her to concede amendments to that Constitution under the threats of her sister States. Fifth. If this amendment grants nothing, except what is already in the Constitution, as some of its friends affirm, then it is superfluous, and ought not to be adopted. Sixth. If this amendment gives new guarantees to slavery, as many suppose, then the State policy of Massachusetts, as treasured in her early history, as set forth in her Bill of Rights, as expressed in her oft-repeated resolves, as embodied in her heroic deeds for freedom, as emblazoned on her monumental battle-fields, demands of this Legislature its rejection. Suppose this amendment should be adopted by three-fourths of all the States of this Union, and thus become a substantive part of the Constitution. What then? Does any one suppose the recreant States will thus be drawn back into brotherly union? The undersigned fully believe that nothing short of an unconditional surrender of power to them will effect this object. Will the Border States be pacified by this amendment? What evidence is there to this effect? The lowest claim presented as satisfactory to them is, so far as the undersigned know, the Crittenden Compromise, with Mr. Powell's amendment. This proposition extends slavery into all the territories now possessed, or to be hereafter acquired south of 36 deg. 30 min. north latitude; takes away the power of Congress to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, and, in addition to the above specifications, engrafts upon the Constitution, as a substantive part of that instrument, the opinion of the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott case, and makes the whole irrepealable and unamendable forever. Besides many other objectionable features, it utterly disfranchises a whole race. These demands are made by States accustomed to have their demands granted. The proposed Constitutional amendment is but the entering wedge. This is the first amendment ever proposed by Congress, contrary to the general spirit and scope of the original Constitution, and subversive of its principles. If this amendment is admitted, the charm of sacredness which now enshrines the Constitution will be broken; the respect of the people for the Constitution will be lessened; the public sentiment will be demoralized, and other amendments required by the Slave Power will be pressed with renewed vigor and great success. This amendment comes before this Legislature for approval or rejection by no act of their own. It is forced upon them by the recent action of Congress. Will this Legislature shrink from its duty, and throw the responsibility of action upon the next Legislature? Does any one doubt what Massachusetts thinks with regard to this amendment? Would not the reference of this amendment to the next Legislature be regarded by our sister States as a timid and temporizing policy, and hence would not such a course have a tendency to damp the zeal of the friends of freedom, and correspondingly encourage the slave propagandists? The undersigned so believe.

In the times that tried men's souls, in the past, Massachusetts did not shrink from the position which Providence assigned to her. When the Declaration of American Independence hung doubtful on the balance, the heart of Massachusetts found utterance through the voice of John Adams—"Sink or swim, live or die, survive or perish, I stand for the Declaration." This decisive act made firm the wavering, cheered the friends and disheartened the opponents of that grave and momentous declaration, which proved to be the prelude of that "agony of glory" which followed. Shall Massachusetts now, at a crisis more fearful to liberty than the crisis of 1776, fail to utter with equal emphasis, by the voice of her Legislature, "Sink or swim, live or die, survive or perish, Massachusetts stands by the Constitution as it is"? We believe Border States propose to remain loyal to the Constitution and the Union of the United States, so long as the Constitution remains unchanged! Do they propose to wait as good and peaceful members of a great confederacy, the result of constitutional amendments proposed, and carried in a constitutional manner? Far otherwise! They stand between the General Government and the recusant States, threatening one and cheering on the other, making open and public declaration that they will resist by force any attempt on the part of the General Government to enforce the laws. The undersigned think that Massachusetts, under the circumstances, has but one course to pursue, consistent with a proper respect for the past, with honor in the present, and with fidelity to the future, and that is an uncompromising adherence to the Constitution as it is interpreted in the light of the great principles upon which it rests. The undersigned, therefore, respectfully recommend that this Legislature, by a yea and nay vote, pass upon the proposed constitutional amendment.

N. H. WHITING, Senate.
O. W. ALBEE, J. M. ROBBINS, House.

All the matters reported on by the Committee on Federal Relations were laid on the table, and ordered to be printed.

SECESSION IN NEW MEXICO—GOVERNOR RENCHER HEADS IT—FORT MARCY IN POSSESSION OF THE REVOLUTIONISTS.—*Las Vegas, New Mexico*, March 12, 1861. The stage arrived here this morning from Santa Fe, *en route* for the States, and as it was about leaving here on its way in, an express arrived from Colonel Fauntleroy, commandant at Fort Union, ordering this officer to prepare for defence. On yesterday morning, about 11 o'clock, the people of the capital, (Santa Fe,) Americans and Mexicans *en masse*, seeming to have sprung up like "Cadmus' men," well armed and in great numbers, at once seized and now hold Fort Marcy. Col. F. declined to surrender the Fort, as was expected, and while in the act of remonstrating with the populace, the citizen soldiery rushed upon the works, and in ten minutes they were taken possession of.

Governor Rencher was the prime mover in these proceedings, and he now has charge of all the military equipments and public property. Everybody is surprised at this well concocted and efficient *coup d'annee*. In brief, New Mexico now has declared for and practically affiliated with Texas and the South, and the United States is suddenly ignored and our allegiance changed!

Arizona also absolves her allegiance on the 10th inst. —*St. Louis Republican, April 2d.*

RETRIBUTIVE JUSTICE. After the attack of the Charlestonians on the Star of the West, a brisk controversy was carried on through the columns of the local press concerning the person who was entitled to the credit of firing the first shot at that vessel. The end of the dispute was the recognition of one St. Clair Morgan as the man who did the deed. St. Clair Morgan wore his laurels proudly, but after enjoying the praises of all Charleston for a season, he betook himself to Florida. At Pensacola, on the 21st ult., he had a deadly quarrel with an officer of Capt. O'Hara's command, belonging to Bragg's army. A challenge was given, a duel was fought, and Morgan fell dead at the first shot. The ball from his antagonist's pistol entered the lower part of his abdomen, and passed entirely through his body. So dies St. Clair Morgan, the first man who fired a hostile shot in the South.

CONTEMPTIBLE MEANNESS OF THE SECEDERS!—The Charleston correspondent of the *Tribune* says:—

"The Postal arrangements still remain in the hands of the United States, and are conducted and carried on as usual, principally at the expense of the North. I refer to this subject, however, for the purpose of calling the attention of the Postmaster at Charleston to the fact that the gentlemen who did represent South Carolina in the United States Congress, but who resigned and now profess to owe allegiance only to the treasonable Government at Montgomery, are still taking advantage—and a very mean one it is—of the privileges of members of Congress, and are franking letters through the Post-Office. This I know was done so lately as yesterday by Mr. Porcher Miles, and the fraud is doubtless practised by others."

CHICAGO, April 5. Four persons charged with being fugitives—a father and mother, and their two children—were taken hence to Springfield on Wednesday. They were examined before Commissioner Corneau yesterday, and *delivered over to their owners*.

CHICAGO, April 8. One hundred and six fugitive slaves left here last night for Canada. It is estimated that over a thousand fugitives have arrived here since last fall.

DETROIT, April 8. Three hundred fugitive slaves, principally from Illinois, have left here for Canada since last Saturday.

☞ A. T. FOSS, Agent of the Massachusetts A. S. Society, will speak at

Weare, N. H.,	Sunday, April 14.
North Weare,	Monday, " 15.
Essex, Mass.,	Sunday, " 21.
Manchester, Mass.,	Monday, " 22.
Manchester, N. H.,	Sunday, " 28.

☞ MRS. E. L. ROSE will speak in New Bedford, Sunday, April 14.

☞ HENRY C. WRIGHT will speak at Marlborough, Sunday, April 14, at 10 1-2 o'clock, A. M.

Feltonville,	Sunday, April 14.
Valley Falls, R. I.,	" " 21.
Manchester, N. H.,	" " 28.

☞ E. H. HEYWOOD will speak at

Hopedale,	Sunday A. M., April 21.
Milford.	" P. M., " "

☞ SOUTH DANVERS.—An Anti-Slavery meeting will be held at South Danvers, Town Hall, on Sunday next, April 14, at 2 and 7 1-2 o'clock, P. M. PARKER PILLSBURY, WM. LLOYD GARRISON, Jr., and others, will give addresses. Let there be such an attendance as the momentousness of these imperilled times demands.

☞ WM. WELLS BROWN will speak as follows on Slavery:—

At Taunton,	Sunday evening,	April 14.
" Raynham,	Tuesday	" 16.
" Easton,	Wednesday	" 17.
" South Easton,	Thursday	" 18.

WANTED.—By a young man, 22 years of age, a situation as Book-keeper, Secretary, or Amanuensis. Understands book-keeping both by double and single entry, is a good penman, correct to figures, and can furnish good references as to character and ability. Would prefer to work for an Abolitionist or a Republican. Address D. W. D., Box 2702, P. O. April 12—3t

☞ MRS. M. D. JACKSON, M. D., having had fifteen years' experience in the Homeopathic treatment of diseases, offers her professional services to the Ladies and Children of Boston and vicinity.

References.—David Thayer, M. D., Luther Clark, M. D.; John M. Tarbell, M. D., Boston. Eliphalet Clark, M. D., Portland, Me.

Rooms No. 34 Bowdoin and 10 Allston streets. Office hours from 2 to 4, P. M.

DIED—In Hancock, (N. H.,) March 22, Capt. DAVID BOUTELLE, of paralysis, aged 67 years. Obituary notice, next week.

HOPEDALE
HOME SCHOOL.

THE next (Summer) Term of the Institution will commence on *Wednesday*, May 1, and continue *Ten Weeks*. Thoroughly Reformatory and Progressive in its spirit and character, it must rely chiefly upon the patronage of the more advanced and liberal portion of the public for support.

For particulars, send for Circular to the address of WM. S. HAYWOOD, ABBIE B. HAYWOOD, } *Principals.*
Hopedale, Milford, Mass., March 30, 1861. 4w

The Herald of Progress,
ANDREW JACKSON DAVIS, EDITOR,
ASSISTED BY AN ASSOCIATION OF ABLE WRITERS AND CORRESPONDENTS.

COSMOPOLITAN in every department of knowledge; its crystallized thoughts are intended to furnish a beacon light for the future. Its columns are open to communications upon every subject. Its work is, to elevate the mind, and to add to man's material comforts. Particular attention is given to the department of Health, with new and progressed methods of treating disease, by the Editor. Devoted to no sect, belonging to no party, not given to ONE IDEA, it presents itself to a liberal-minded community, and asks their co-operation.

The *Herald of Progress* is published every Saturday, on a double folio of eight pages, for two dollars per annum, or one dollar for six months, in advance. Specimen copies forwarded gratis. Address A. J. DAVIS & CO., 274 Canal street, New York. April 10.

A New and Highly Important
MONTHLY.

LEWIS'S NEW GYMNASTICS, AND BOSTON JOURNAL OF PHYSICAL CULTURE, will be published at Lewis's New Gymnasium, No. 20 Essex Street, at the head of Harrison Avenue.

More than Two Hundred New Exercises will be presented in this Journal, making a system admirably adapted to both public and private use.

The paper will be largely illustrated. Let no one interested in Physical Culture fail to send for it.

Single copy, $1.00; three copies, $2.00; five copies, $3.00; ten copies, $5.00—strictly in advance.

All letters to be addressed, DR. DIO LEWIS, Box No. 12, Boston, Mass.

In connection with his Gymnasium, Dr. Lewis has established a Swedish Movement Cure for the treatment of Spinal Curvatures, Paralysis, and Stiffened Joints.

DR. LEWIS'S BLOW GUN,

An admirable means of strengthening the Lungs, may be obtained at the Gymnasium. A distinguished physician declares—"Wherever this delightful and beneficial amusement is introduced, consumption will become comparatively rare."

Copper Gun with plated mouth-piece and box of arrows, $2.00.

LEWIS'S SPIROMETER,

A beautiful and ingenious invention, calculated to enlarge and invigorate the chest; full of interest and benefit. The *Water Cure World* says—"Dr. Lewis's Spirometer is just the thing, and an actual need in every family who care to have good lungs, or to be free from scrofula."

And again, "No conceivable practice will so surely keep open these air cells, and greatly enlarge the lungs, as the daily use of Lewis's Spirometer."

THE CHESS BALL GAME, the PARLOR SKATES, and the apparatus for every other active sport, can be obtained at the same place.

Dr. Lewis receives at his Gymnasium children in delicate health, and trains them with special care. Parents with such children are cordially invited to call and witness the modes of training.

There are, likewise, classes of Ladies and Gentlemen. The management is such, that the weakest as well as the strongest are very happily improved. The sexes exercise together.

All who are interested in Physical Culture are invited to drop in at 20 Essex Street, at the head of Harrison Avenue. April 12.

The British Reviews,
AND
Blackwood's Magazine.

1. THE LONDON QUARTERLY, (Conservative.)
2. THE EDINBURGH REVIEW, (Whig.)
3. THE NORTH BRITISH REVIEW, (Free Church.)
4. THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW, (Liberal.)
5. BLACKWOOD'S EDINBURGH MAGAZINE, (Tory.)

TERMS.

	Per ann.
For any one of the four Reviews,	$3 00
For any two of the four Reviews,	5 00
For any three of the four Reviews,	7 00
For all four of the Reviews,	8 00
For Blackwood's Magazine,	3 00
For Blackwood and one Review,	5 00
For Blackwood and two Reviews,	7 00
For Blackwood and three Reviews,	9 00
For Blackwood and the four Reviews,	10 00

N. B.—*The price in Great Britain of the five Periodicals above-named is $31 per annum.*

Republished by LEONARD SCOTT & CO., 54 Gold Street, New York.
Dec. 28. 6m

LINDA.

INCIDENTS IN THE LIFE OF A SLAVE GIRL, Seven Years concealed in Slavery; narrated by herself; with an Introduction by LYDIA MARIA CHILD, and a Letter by AMY POST. A handsome book of 306 pages, just issued, which is receiving highly commendatory notices from the press. Price, $1.00. Orders for mailing must include sixteen cents in postage stamps.

Address WM. C. NELL, 221 Washington street.
F8 tf

Poetry.

For the Liberator.

AMERICA'S RESPONSIBILITY TO LIBERTY.

Oh, noble land of mountain, river, lake,
From sea to sea magnificent than ever old world,
Of union of social wealth, of fertile soils,
Of mighty forests, coal of gentlest wills,
Where countless lands unmated may freely range;
Land of rich fields and vast, of luxurious flowers,
Around whose sign gay glittering banners float;
Whose grasses can't coal with the song of birds;
Land whose ambient is saturated as by balm,
Its beggars; and whose vast boundaries reclaim
Both bright heat and winter's icy-laced realm,
And the Atlantic and Pacific, whose waves
Lash water than the mightiest States of other
Oh, sunder then within those dark inlets bars;
What cannot their excellence, may cause thing from
Oppression of the helpless, that basic bond
Of slavery crushed yet aside crushed bear.

Yet that great States of old, whose words yet shine
Forms as of gorgeous opposite, were bound
Those bonds, blasted them, I did not hear
The Christ whose ye'll call "Master," died to teach;
For the golden sayings of that lips imitated;
Gods trust, weighed, false, frivolous.

Oh, grievous land!—and does thy boasting still
Profane old Runnymede's return, while thy song,
Forgetful and regardful to the fleer
Of all this earth—wonderful, and yet, alas,
Of the responsibility it brings,
Storms, mockingly, to remonstrate
The two religious which the Lord declared
Impossible. "Ye cannot serve," he cried,
"With two obligations, both God and Mammon."

Are you so blind, American proud eyes,
Asyet to see slavery and such-attends
Are bringing you "Mammon" and defiance?
Will not that synonym you now permit
End in with austerity, all in your name,
The just of slaughter, who still mourning cry,
"Behold the end of all these calamities"—
At a passing widow's renewed king?
Behold the fate of vanquish Liberty?
It made in anarchy and intolerable?

Why should the strong North never believe the South
Are if who told the cause of Destiny?
Oh, Northern freemen, do to you help
Your hearts, your children? Therefore not for them?
Leave them beneath the case of Freedom's God?
Turn ye from your brothers with freedom gold?
Better is honest poverty than wealth
Wrung by a promise from slaves' wasted toil.
Fruit wealth still hungry a curse to sup the wall,
And unstable hide their ground planted.

Worcester, Eng. JANE ANDREW.

For the Liberator.

LAKES LAND.

A PARODY.

Air—"*Dixie's Land.*"

The Yankees' love for sons, is native;
The Yankee land is ruled by Cotton:
Look around! We needn't look around in Yankee land!
In Yankee land which I was born in,
The "higher law" they treat with scorning:
Look around! look around! look around in Yankee land!

CHORUS.

Yet I'm glad that I'm a Yankee—hooray! hooray!
In Yankee land I'll take my stand,
To live as honest Yankee
Away! away! will work honestly!
Hooray! hooray! I'll be an honest Yankee!

Each day, as I around am walking,
I see rain men and women stalking,
Strolling round, &c.
They'll turn their eyes up at a nigger,
They feel that they're a good deal bigger,
Strutting round, &c.

CHORUS.—Yet I'm glad, &c.

VI.

Yet what their feathers feel and master!
Just stays his whip, they'll travel faster,
Scouting round, &c.
At much indignation—at a threat status,—
At them go home to his plantation,
Scouting round, &c.

CHORUS.—Yet I'm glad, &c.

Boston, April 2, 1846. JUSTUS.

For the Liberator.

WHAT I HAVE SEEN.

I have seen You a god stand forth,
Before his other thousands bend;
Seen modest Votes ennobled to earth,
Boots trampled by a higher mind!

While Falsehood has spoke out with pride,
Has listened to his cunning speech,
From honest Truth they have turned aside,
Nor heard they what she had to teach.

I've seen the Right bowed down by Wrong
Seen men enslaved by tyrant Might;
The cost of all the outraged throng
Hath dared to condemn the right.

Seen men beneath the oppressor's rod,
(Strength, hand and bosom, the price to bind)
And pensioners of Slip mood, sit God!
Quote texts to sanction their mind!

While dumest in prostrate prison
Were only shrieked from the corners,
From were the little boys have
Without a soul to shield their form.

I've seen, while galmed Kossuth lay
On inextinguishingly from every clime,
Repentant Wrath go forth to-day,
In penalty to only crime!

I've seen, ay, while this sin-spot was
His splendid robes for gained display,
The faithful bitter comedy shed!
I've seen—and see it every day.

Anderer. MARIA BROOKS.

FRIENDS OF FREEDOM.

Ye friends of freedom, flatter not
Nor cringe your knee to any wight,
Tell things as dearly bought,
Estimate to all beneath the sun.

Then ally still from every State,
And battle on your armor well;
Who freedom love and liberty hate,
Let love of truth your bosom swell.

A faltering foe will ever yield,
While shining lustres allure their spear—
Rise, friends of freedom! Join the field,
And take the fee upon anywhere.

A universal cause is ours,
Our motives touch to all mankind,
Content to live with all your powers,
Assume the heavy, the honor, they shall find.

Our freedom's lord's pause all at stake;
Make way for liberty! Step up!
The pillars now begin to shake,
Slavery soo long is doomed to die.

Awakened Music of the lyre,
While mantle lay for fair Freedom's hands,
Stand firm, and never shed the tyrant,
While liberals of truth hold up your hands.

And when we gain for Freedom's sway,
We'll rest secure from all our foes,
From strife and rancor and contest,
Freedom enjoy, with sweet repose.

The Liberator.

[From the pamphlet "The People," by Karl Heinzen, 1845.]

THE PEOPLE AND THE STATE.

BY O.

The Unitarian State and the Federative State.

[TRANSLATED FOR THE LIBERATOR.]

(Concluded.)

If we confine the question concretely, it will be seen that federation is the *closest union*, by which States, that can no longer supply much their destination of secure their interests, may gradually get into the character of the unitarian State; or that it is a rule border, by which such States may dwell themselves, for the time has arrived for them to form another, more natural, and higher union. The States have hitherto related under that form have engaged a greater freedom than others, (which resulted from their former) and only repulsive to urge able to form a confederacy; provide the latter cause is considered federation is the *dissolution of all State, and the condition of liberty.* This relation never has been, especially suppose it for North America, where another relation cannot be to be considered, that the true cause of the interested of the Independence not be in the *federal system*, but in the economic need by the *want to the system of consolidation.* We know from history how much the Colonies have suffered, when unsupported but to be made, to bring the several confederacies up to a consolidation, which, by the very need made, must either be enlarged, or again extended.

Another circumstance, that has retarded federation in regard to the federative system, has been the free and inefficient of the consolidation in the States, especially in France. On the one hand, North America is so isolated, that it can dispense with the most perfect mode of consolidation; on the other, we are relieved in France for the purpose of those ego and deficient States centralization will be high. Yet, neither exists simple power, as the unitarian State, which only